

Michael P. Huerta, the acting chief information officer at the Department of Transportation, which last year was given an "F" by Horn for its inattention to the date issue.

Horn and Rep. Thomas M. David III (R-Va.) said they were concerned that some agencies have allotted only six or seven months to test the changes to their computer systems. Yesterday the GAO recommended agencies give themselves at least a year for testing.

"They're pushing the envelope so close to D-Day," Horn said.

The chief information officers, however, promised the subcommittee that their systems would be fixed in time. "You can be confident we'll get the job done," said Emmett Paige Jr., an assistant secretary of defense. He complained that a requirement to report the department's progress regularly to the OMB, the GAO and the subcommittee "stretches our resources [to fix the glitch] a little thinner."

Some computer systems already are experiencing the date problem, said Keith A. Rhodes, a GAO technical director. A Defense Department contractor last month received a 97-year delinquency notice on a three-year contract due to be completed in January 2000, he said.

Horn also questioned the OMB's latest cost estimate for fixing the problem, which it has pegged at about \$2.3 billion. After the hearing, Horn called the figure "way too low" because it does not include devices such as elevators that rely on microprocessors that might need to be reprogrammed. The estimate also does not take into account higher labor costs for computer programmers as December 1999 draws closer, he said.

Yesterday, some department officials stood by their estimates, while others took the opportunity to slightly revise projections. The Department of Transportation, for example, added \$10 million to its estimate, raising it to about \$90 million. At the Defense Department, which faces the largest problem of any federal agency, Paige said its current \$1.2 billion price tag is only temporary.

"I submit that as we continue the assessment [of computer systems], that figure will continue to rise," Paige said. ●

#### POPULATION ASSISTANCE

● Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask that the following background statement be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

[From the National Right to Life Committee, Inc., Jan. 28, 1997]

BACKGROUND ON THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S PROMOTION OF ABORTION THROUGH THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM FOR "POPULATION ASSISTANCE"

Abortion should not, and need not, be interjected into the "population assistance" program as the Clinton Administration has done. At the end of the Bush Administration, under the pro-life "Mexico City Policy" (described below), the U.S. "population assistance" program provided 45% of the total pool of "family planning" funds contributed by all donor nations. Much of this money went to some 400 private foreign organizations that provided non-abortion services in developing countries.

NRLC takes no position on contraception, or on federal funding of contraceptive services, whether in the U.S. or overseas. Throughout the Reagan and Bush Administration, NRLC testified that it had no objection regarding the increases in "population assistance" funding that were approved during that era, because the Reagan-Bush "Mexico City Policy" governed those funds. The

"Mexico City Policy," in effect from 1984 through 1992, provided that U.S. population assistance funds would not support private foreign organizations that perform abortions (except in cases of life endangerment, rape, or incest) or lobby to legalize abortion in foreign nations.

However, President Clinton radically changed the thrust of the program. Upon taking office, he immediately nullified the Mexico City Policy. Subsequently, the Clinton Administration granted massive funding to certain organizations that are heavily involved in promoting the legalization and provision of abortion in foreign nations, chief among these the London-based International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF). (IPPF-London had refused to accept U.S. funds under the Mexico City Policy. However, about half [57] of IPPF's national affiliates did accept U.S. funds under the "Mexico City" conditions.)

IPPF-London has often made it clear that the legalization of abortion and the expansion of abortion networks are among its primary goals. The IPPF's 1992 mission statement, Strategic Plan-Vision 2000, repeatedly and unambiguously instructs IPPF's 140 national affiliate organizations to work to legalize abortion as part of a mandate to "advocate for changes in restrictive national laws, policies, practices and traditions." Precise strategies for accomplishing this end are discussed in the summary of IPPF's Mauritius Conference. (See "Promotion of Abortion in the Developing World by the IPPF," Population Research Institute report, 1996) "Progress" toward abortion legalization that IPPF has recently accomplished in specific nations (including Thailand, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Uruguay) are described in the IPPF Annual Report Supplement in 1994-95.

Donald P. Warwick of the Harvard Institute for International Development has written the IPPF "has in word and deed been one of the foremost lobbyists for abortion in the developing countries." In a 1996 report, the Population Research Institute observed: "No other organization has done more to spread abortion throughout the world than the International Planned Parenthood Federation . . . the IPPF has forcefully and repeatedly stated its intention to assist in the legalization of abortion in every country of the world . . . and has also voiced its willingness to equip abortion centers and provide the expertise required to perform abortions on a massive scale."

The Clinton Administration has pressured foreign governments to get in line with its forcefully declared doctrine that legal "abortion is a fundamental right of all women." Indeed, on March 16, 1994, Secretary of State Warren Christopher sent an "action cable" to all U.S. diplomats and consular posts. The cable called for "senior level diplomatic interventions" to urge host governments to support U.S. priorities for an upcoming U.N. population conference. The cable read: "The priority issues for the U.S. include assuring . . . access to safe abortion. [ . . . ] The United States believes that access to safe, legal and voluntary abortion is a fundamental right of all women."

In May, 1993, Under Secretary of State Tim Wirth gave a speech on population control in which he proclaimed, "A government which is violating basic human rights should not hide behind the defense of sovereignty . . . Our position is to support reproductive choice, including access to safe abortion." At about the same time, Mr. Wirth said that the Administration goal was to make this "reproductive choice" available to every woman in the world by 2,000 AD. At the 1994 Cairo conference on population control, sponsored by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and at more recent U.N.-sponsored

conferences, the Clinton Administration has zealously promoted this doctrine, and has brought pressures to bear on delegates that resist it.

Groups that support the Administration's abortion doctrine often insist that "U.S. law already prohibits the use of population assistance funds for abortion." This is a red herring. The "existing law" referred to is the 1973 Helms Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, it has been construed very narrowly, as barring the direct use of U.S. funds to pay for abortion procedures overseas. But the real issue is not the direct payment for individual abortion procedures, but the Clinton Administration's perversion of the population assistance program to promote the legalization and expansion of access to abortion as a birth control method in developing nations. It is noteworthy that after less than three months in office, the White House urged Congress to repeal the Helms Amendment, declaring abortion to be "part of the overall approach to population control" (White House press security, April 1, 1993).

The Clinton Administration's extrapolations regarding how many abortions U.S. funds supposedly "prevent" completely ignore the abortion-promoting activities of the Administration and those of its taxpayer-funded surrogates such as IPPF. For example, they completely disregard the vast increases in the number of abortions that result when a nation's laws protecting the unborn are removed. As Stanley Henshaw, deputy director of research for the Alan Guttmacher Institute, a pro-abortion advocacy group, acknowledged in a June 16, 1994 document, "In most countries, it is common after abortion is legalized for abortion rates to rise sharply for several years, then stabilize, just as we have seen in the United States."

The Clinton Administration's overseas abortion crusade is on a collision course with the laws, and the cultural and religious values, that predominate in most developing nations, including nearly all of Latin America, most of Africa, and many places in Asia. About 95 U.N. member states have laws that permit abortion only in narrowly defined circumstances. These laws cover 37 percent of the world's population, or over two billion (2,000,000,000) persons. (Under Secretary Wirth has been quoted as saying that all except 17 U.N. countries "permit" abortion, but this is highly misleading, since he refers only to nations with total bans on abortion. Typical abortion laws in developing nations, permitting abortion only to save the life of the mother or in other narrowly defined circumstances, are far removed from the Administration's "fundamental right," abortion-on-demand doctrine.)

#### ACTION DURING THE 104TH CONGRESS

During 1995, the House of Representatives repeatedly voted in favor of amendments offered by Congressman Chris Smith (R-NJ), the chairman of the House International Relations Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, to restore the Reagan-Bush policy. The Smith language would deny U.S. "population assistance" funds to foreign private organizations that perform abortions (except life of the mother, rape, or incest), that violate foreign abortion laws, or that lobby to change foreign abortion laws. (Note: neither the Mexico City Policy, nor the Smith amendments, placed any restrictions on counseling regarding legal abortions.) However, the White House threatened to veto any bill that contained Rep. Smith's language, which contributed to the defeat of the House-passed language in the Senate.

Finally in January, 1996, in order to disentangle the foreign operations appropriations bill (HR 1868) from this debate, a compromise was reached under which (1) the

Smith policy language was dropped, (2) FY 1996 appropriations for population assistance was reduced by 35%, and (3) a formula was adopted to delay USAID's ability to obligate some of the appropriate money, in order to allow Congress further opportunities to curb the Administration's pro-abortion crusade.

During 1996, the House offered a compromise in the form of a far weaker pro-life provision, the "Callahan 50/50 Amendment." Under this provision, organizations that violated the "Mexico City" conditions would have remained eligible for funding, but at only 50% of the FY 1995 level. (This restriction would have applied only to new, FY 1997 funds—not to the \$303 million carried over from FY 1996.) In a September conference committee, appropriators coupled the Callahan provision to additional language that would have allowed obligation of an additional \$293 million in population-control funding during FY 1997—for a total of as much as \$713 million. But White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta told the appropriators that President Clinton would veto the entire omnibus funding bill rather than accept this proffered compromise.

Because of this veto threat, the final September funding bill [now PL 104-208] contained no new policy language to constrain the Administration's pro-abortion activities—but again set a population-control funding level about one-third lower than the 1995 figure, and placed "metering" limitations on how soon the Administration can obligate those funds.

This episode perfectly illustrated the White House's ideological commitment to keeping abortion as a fundamental component of the program, at all costs—reflecting its close alliance with organizations such as the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA), an organization that has openly proclaimed its operating "principal" that "reproductive freedom is indivisible" (i.e., that abortion must not be treated differently from other birth control options). Immediately following the episode described above, Gloria Feldt, president of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, said her side had won "a moral victory in defeating abortion restrictions," but added, "The cost has been enormous."

The September law also guaranteed the White House a chance to substantially increase the amount of money that it can obligate during FY 1997. Under the law, President Clinton must file a "finding" with Congress no later than February 1, stating his opinion regarding the effects of funding cuts on "the proper functioning of the population planning program." The law further requires that, before the end of February, both the House and the Senate must vote on a joint resolution which, if approved, would release an additional \$123 million in population-control funds during the current fiscal year—without any restrictions on the use of these funds for the Administration's pro-abortion activities.●

#### MEXICO AND DRUG CERTIFICATION

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, this week, President Clinton must make an important decision regarding our Nation's fight against illegal drug trafficking. He must decide by March 1 whether to certify that Mexico and Colombia have, in the past year, taken all appropriate and necessary actions in the fight against international narcotics trafficking.

Under the international antidrug law, in order for a country which is either a major source of narcotics or a major drug transit country to continue

to receive U.S. aid, the President must certify as adequate the performance of that country in cooperating with the United States or taking its own actions in the drug fight.

The law gives the President three choices. First, he can certify that the country is either fully cooperating with the United States or has taken adequate steps on its own to combat the narcotics trade. Second, he can decertify the country, concluding that the country has failed to meet the requirements of cooperation or action. Third, he can provide a vital national interest waiver—essentially a finding that the country has not met the standards of the law, but that our own national interest is best protected by continuing to provide assistance to the country.

With respect to Colombia, I believe the only appropriate course for the President to follow is to decertify Colombia, just as he did last year. There is too much credible evidence that Colombian President Samper has taken millions in campaign contributions from the Cali Cartel and that he has failed to take the antidrug and anticorruption actions that he pledged to us in 1994.

The question of Mexico is more complicated. Mexico is the leading transit country for cocaine coming into the United States: 50 to 70 percent of all cocaine shipped into the United States comes through Mexico. It is also a significant source of heroin, methamphetamines, and marijuana.

President Zedillo seems to be strongly committed to rid the Mexican law enforcement system of corruption and to fight the Mexican drug cartels. However, the reports and events of the past few weeks have made it clear that corruption in police ranks—even up to the very top ranks—is still rampant in Mexico.

Just last week, it was revealed that the man hired only 3 months ago to be Mexico's drug czar—the head of their antinarcotics agency—was fired abruptly after being accused of taking bribes from one of Mexico's most powerful drug lords. It would be as if our own drug czar, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, were found to be in league with drug gangs in our country.

Why didn't the Mexican Government tell us weeks ago that their man was under investigation? Why did they let our own drug agency brief him and give him important intelligence about our antidrug efforts? That is not cooperation by any standard.

Mexico has also failed in the past year to take its own steps to meet the standards of the certification law. It has not acted boldly to root out corruption in its law enforcement establishment; it has acted to extradite to the United States only a few Mexican nationals suspected of involvement in United States drug activities; it has failed to implement new anticrime laws enacted last year.

Given these facts, I do not believe Mexico should be certified in compliance with the drug law. However, I be-

lieve the President would be justified in granting a vital national interest waiver of the requirements of the law. That would send a message to Mexico that its actions in the past year were inadequate; but it would allow the United States to continue joint efforts with President Zedillo and others in his administration who are committed to the drug fight.●

#### BLACK HISTORY MONTH

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, for more than 70 years, February has been designated as the month in which we honor the achievements and contributions of African-Americans to our history, our culture and our future. One remarkable African-American leader, W.E.B. DuBois, made an observation in 1903 that bears great significance for this celebration. "Herein lies the tragedy of the age," he said, "that men know so little of men." Since 1926, Black History Month has challenged us to mitigate that tragedy, encouraging us to study the lives of both our most noted heroes and those whose stories have remained untold.

As it does each year, the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History has selected a theme for this month's celebration. Its theme for 1997, "African-Americans and Civil Rights: A Reappraisal," focuses on the pioneers, leaders, and venues in the civil rights struggle that are often unrecognized. In light of this, I want to pay tribute to an extraordinary group of African-American artists from my State of Maryland who, despite their undeniably significant contributions to our culture, nevertheless remain relatively unknown. Yet, given their landmark accomplishments, these individuals would be important role models for aspiring artists of all backgrounds. By pushing the limits of their artistic mediums, the international respect earned by these artists advanced the struggle for the equal recognition of all people, both in our society and under its laws. I salute the association for selecting a theme that focuses on more of our Nation's unsung heroes.

At the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre in Stratford-upon-Avon, there sits a memorial chair dedicated to Ira Aldridge, one of the greatest Shakespearean tragedians of his day. Born in Baltimore in 1805, Aldridge's performances were so popular with heads of state that he was the first African American to be knighted. He drew praise from New York to Prussia, with a diverse repertoire of roles that included Othello, Macbeth, Shylock, Lear and Richard III. Known as "The Celebrated African Tragedian," Aldridge was called "without doubt the greatest actor that has ever been seen in Europe," by a Viennese critic, and "the most beautiful male artist that one can imagine," by a Prussian. Pioneers like Aldridge made possible careers like those